

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/887,832 06/21/2001 Elaine A. Delack P0136 8018 **EXAMINER** 02/24/2006 Todd N. Hathaway PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL Attorney at Law ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 119 N. Commercial St., # 620 Bellingham, WA 98225-4437 1616

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/887,832	DELACK, ELAINE A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alton N. Pryor	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 No.	ovember 2005.		
	a) This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4 and 18-24</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,4,19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18 and 21</u> is/are rejected.			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>22-24</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r .		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	. ,		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	∤d.	
Attachment(s)	4.□ 1-4 1	(DTO 442)	
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 18,21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. What is meant by the phrase "neurodegenerative, multiple sclerosis related conditions"? The phrase appears to be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Clajms 18,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder et al (WO 9611009; 4/18/96). Loder teaches a method of treating multiple sclerosis comprising administering to a patient in need thereof a monoamine oxidase inhibitor (agonist). Loder does not teach the administering of an "A" type monoamine oxidase agonist. In the absence of unexpected results, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been expected to employ a monoamine oxidase A inhibitor in the prior art invention. One would have been motivated to do this since monoamine oxidase A agonist is a species within monoamine oxidase inhibitors. Species in genus are obvious

Art Unit: 1616

since they have similar properties, and therefore would have been expected to exhibit similar activity.

Claims 18,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lieb (US 4409243; 10/11/83). Lieb teaches a method of treating multiple sclerosis comprising administering to a patient in need thereof a monoamine oxidase inhibitor (agonist). Loder does not teach the administering of an "A" type monoamine oxidase agonist. In the absence of unexpected results, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been expected to employ a monoamine oxidase A inhibitor in the prior art invention. One would have been motivated to do this since monoamine oxidase A agonist is a species within monoamine oxidase inhibitors. Species in genus are obvious since they have similar properties, and therefore would have been expected to exhibit similar activity.

Claim Objection

Claims 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach or suggest instant method comprising reserpine.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

Application/Control Number: 09/887,832 Page 4

Art Unit: 1616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alton Pryor

Primary Examiner

AU 1616